

"contrary information" where "the SBIs came back and the SF-86s had some things that were different in there," he "believed" he would "have to have an SF-86 to flag a report" because he was "looking for essentially information that contradicted the SF-86."<sup>143</sup>

Later, Mr. Marceca repeated his testimony "to some sense of certainty" that in every case, he was only flagging information that was "contradictory" to information in an SF-86.<sup>144</sup> When pressed on what he would do if he did not have an SF-86, he vaguely referred to "gaps" in background investigations (reflected by missing background reports) and that he would re-request the background reports.<sup>145</sup>

**d. Mr. Marceca's June 18, 1996 House Deposition.**

Mr. Marceca testified directly on the subject of whether he read the substance of the previous background reports in his June 18, 1996 deposition conducted by staff of the House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight. Although Mr. Marceca again described the Update Project process without mentioning that he had read the substance of the reports, he acknowledged reading the reports in an effort to determine where the person worked, which would require more detailed reading than merely looking at

---

<sup>143</sup> Marceca 6/11/96 GJ at 31-32.

<sup>144</sup> Id. at 33.

<sup>145</sup> Id. at 29-33 (emphasis supplied).